

"First in the year 1877, F. Smith¹ thought of [redacted] published generic name, so he wrote a quite new [redacted] *Sima* as a synonym of *Tetraponera*.

"In Smith's 1877 diagnosis stands the sentence: 'There in male and female, obliterated in the worker.' This character does not, however, fit *T. rufonigra*, Jerd., *natalensis*, F. Sm., and *aethiops*, F. Sm., which, nevertheless, are brought forward in the same work.

"Therefore I allowed myself⁴ to again use Smith's name *Tetraponera*, but in no way as the older generic name in the place of *Sima*, but rather to form a new subgenus, made up of Smith's later diagnosis. I held the use of the name *Tetraponera*, 1852, invalid, being withdrawn by the author, and I sank it as a synonym of the genus *Pseudomyrma* (*sensu lato*); the description of 1877 had made the name again applicable, but not with the date 1852, but rather the much younger 1877.

"I also divided the genus *Sima* into the subgenera *Sima* and *Tetraponera*. The subgenus *Sima* included the species with developed ocelli; *Tetraponera* those species without or with rudimentary ocelli. I did not, unfortunately, name types for the two subgenera. Still, for a few years in Continental Europe the signification of genotype had not become the mode, or at least the necessary custom! At any rate I believe that my proposition (1900) to divide the genus *Sima* into subgenera, still had priority over Bingham's (1903) type-naming.

"In my mentioned work two species were placed in the subgenus *Sima*: *rufonigra*, Jerd., and *pilosa*, F. Sm. As *pilosa* does not stand under *Sima* in the meaning of Rogers, only *rufonigra* remains, which must stand as the type of the genus and subgenus. The fixing of the type-species of the genus *Sima* is therefore implicitly shown by me in the year 1900."

We are unable to agree with Emery, who does not seem to realise the actual facts of the case. The question is entirely a matter of nomenclature. It is immaterial what part of the world the species came from, whether Smith was in error over the presence or absence of the ocelli, or as to what he thought he had founded *Tetraponera* upon at a later date. We can only follow the laws of nomenclature, and it is quite clear that *Sima*, Roger (1863), must sink as an isonym of *Tetraponera*, F. Smith (1852) (the types being congeneric), and no one can use them in any other sense.

F. Smith [*Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.*, (2) **9**, 44 (1852)] founded his genus *Tetraponera* on the two species *atrata* and *testacea*, and Wheeler (1911) gives as the type of *Tetraponera*—*T. atrata*, F. Sm. (= *Eciton nigrum*, Jerd., = *Sima nigra*, Emery).

Smith's second species, *testacea*, is not congeneric with *atrata*, but belongs to the genus *Pseudomyrma*; he was, therefore, in error when he stated in 1855 that his genus *Tetraponera* was founded on *Pseudomyrma* ♀ ♀, and he doubtless misled Emery, who incorrectly sunk *Tetraponera* as a synonym of *Pseudomyrma* in 1900. Emery states that *Sima* was founded for more than one species, whereas Roger [*Berlin Ent. Zeitschr.*, **7**, 178 (1863)] founded his genus on a single

¹ *Ann. N. York Acad. Sc.*, **21**, 157-175 (1911).

² *Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond.* (2), **3**, 168 (1855).

³ *Trans. Ent. Soc. Lond.*, 68 (1877).

⁴ *Ann. Mus. Nat. Genova*, **40**, 673, (1900).